UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/580,706	05/25/2006	Tadashi Amino	08228/095001	5332	
22511 OSHA LIANG	590 07/22/2010 LP.		EXAMINER		
TWO HOUSTO	ON CENTER	SENFI, BEHROOZ M			
HOUSTON, TX		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2621		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			07/22/2010	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com buta@oshaliang.com

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/580,70	06	AMINO, TADASHI					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		BEHROO:	Z SENFI	2621					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>25 May 2006</i> .							
· —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 3 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 7 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>									
Application	n Papers								
•	e specification is objected to by the		_						
	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are:								
	pplicant may not request that any obje		-		D 4 4047 D				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
-	der 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
Attachment(s)									
	of References Cited (PTO-892)	OTO 049)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/25/2006</u>.</li> </ul>			5) Notice of Informal Pa						

Art Unit: 2621

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Double Patenting**

- 1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
- 2. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
- 3. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).
- 4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of co-pending application 10/583,532. Although the conflicting claims are not identical in terms of wording and terminology, the scopes of the claims are the same and they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohura (US 2002/0050969).

Regarding claim 1, Ohura discloses, a radio video transmission device for encoding a video signal and radio- transmitting the encoded video signal (i.e., figs. 8-10), the radio video transmission device being configured such that encoding is performed in units of a video signal (i.e., fig. 10, MPEG-4) corresponding to a predetermined number of vertical periods (i.e., paragraphs 0052-0054), intervals at which data of a header of the encoded video signal corresponding to the predetermined number of vertical periods is transmitted conform to the predetermined number of vertical periods (i.e., fig. 10, paragraphs 0052-0054), and during transmission of the header data of the video signal corresponding to the predetermined number of vertical periods, information indicative of the header data is multiplexed and transmitted (i.e., Mux data as shown in fig. 10).

Regarding claim 2, Ohura discloses, a signal generation device for generating an encoded transmission signal which is used for transmitting a video signal through radio communication 9i.e., figs. 8-10), wherein a transmission signal including information obtained by encoding a video signal in units of a video signal corresponding to a predetermined number of vertical periods is generated 9Please refer to claim 1 above),

Art Unit: 2621

and a flag indicative of a header portion of the transmission signal is added to the header portion of the transmission signal (i.e., flag as shown in fig. 10).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohura (US 2002/0050969).

Regarding claim 4, Ohura teaches a flag indicative of a header portion and Multiplexer/demultiplexer, as discussed in the above action (i.e., figs. 9-10).

Ohura is silent to explicitly mention, a flag extraction section in decoding device to extracts a flag indicative of header portion to be used by the decoder.

However, Ohura clearly shows (i.e., figs. 9-10, paragraphs 0012 and 0014) the flag indicative of a header portion being received by the receiver/decoder/demultiplexer, therefore obviously the receiver/decoder/demultiplexer would extract the flag from encoded video signal and based on the information in the header data properly performs the decoding process.

Regarding claim 7, please refer to claim 4 above.

# Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 3 is allowed.

Art Unit: 2621

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of the record fails to anticipate or fairly suggest, a radio video reception device, including; a flag extraction section, a phase comparison section, a voltage controlled oscillator and a timing generation section, as specifies in the claim along with other limitations in the claim.

10. Claims 5-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### Contact

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Behrooz Senfi whose telephone number is 571-272-7339. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Behrooz Senfi/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2621